DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 491 CG 012 158

AUTHOR	Macaulay, Jacqueline
TITLE	On Women, Anger and Aggression.
PUB DATE	Oct 77
NOTE	48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (San Francisco, California, August 26-30, 1977)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adjustment (to Environment); *Aggression; *Emotional Response; *Females; Psychological Patterns; Psychological Studies; *Response Mode; Sex Role; *Socialization; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS	*Anger

ABSTRACT

This paper concerns the variety of responses women commonly make to provocation--to frustration, thwarting, hurt, deprivation, and other conditions which usually lead to some kind of emotional arousal, the experience of anger, and possibly aggression. Gender differences (culturally shaped) are reviewed where relevant, and a brief review of the socialization for pacifism versus aggression is also given. Several "scripts" for women's reactions to provocation are given. These involve aggression-turned-inward, anger defined as "hurt" and subsequent forms of counteraggression, open and direct forms of counteraggression, and coping responses to provocation. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150491

On Women, Anger and Aggression

Jacqueline Macaulay

314 Shepard Terrace
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

October, 1977
To be submitted for publication
Comments welcome

Author footnote

Portions of this paper were presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, August, 1977. I would like to thank Stewart Macaulay, Ann Frodi, Julia Sherman, Pauline Thome and Joyce Walstedt for helpful comments. Requests for reprints may be addressed to the author at 314 Shepard Terrace, Madison, WI 53705.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jacqueline Macaulay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM"

CG012158

On Women, Anger and Aggression

ABSTRACT

This paper concerns the variety of responses women commonly make to provocation--to frustration, thwarting, hurt, deprivation, and other conditions which usually lead to some kind of emotional arousal, the experience of anger, and possibly aggression. Gender differences (culturally shaped) are reviewed where relevant, and a brief review of the socialization for pacifism versus aggression is also given. Several "scripts" for women's reactions to provocation are given. These involve aggression-turned-inward, anger defined as "hurt" and subsequent forms of counteraggression, open and direct forms of counteraggression, and coping responses to provocation.

On Women, Anger and Aggression

This paper will concern the variety of responses women commonly make to provocation--to frustration, thwarting, hurt, deprivation, and other conditions which usually lead to some kind of emotional arousal, the experience of anger, and possibly aggression. My focus is not on gender differences, although comparative statements are unavoidable because of the predominantly male focus in the existing literature. There may or may not be some basic biological sex difference in aggressiveness--that is an interesting but separate issue (and one which will probably remain undecided for some time). However that issue is settled, it will not change the importance of understanding how human aggression (and perhaps nonhuman primate aggression, as Plotnik, 1974, has argued) is shaped by learned motives and response patterns and by social factors. (See, e.g., Bandura, 1973; Berkowitz, 1973; Rohner, 1976; Whiting & Edwards, 1973)

As will be described briefly below, there clearly are culturally shaped gender differences in aggression. What emerges when one begins to examine the relevant literature is that aggression theorists have limited theory development by focussing on easily studied, male-stereotypic forms of aggression and by neglecting alternative responses to provocation and many variables which do not figure in the standard description of (male) aggression. As clinicians well know, there are many ways of coping and not coping with provocation, some healthy and some not, some destructive of others and some destructive of self, and some which are constructive, nonaggressive responses to common

human dilemmas.

Thus this paper will focus on the experimental and clinical evidence on adult women's reactions to provocation, evidence up to now largely neglected by aggression theory. I will consider not only the behavior usually labeled "aggression" in the literature, but also other reactions to provocation such as denial of anger and behavior which is not usually recognized as aggressive. Although gender differences are not my chief focus, I will describe some which, in the absence of other taxonomies, help to delineate variations in reactions to provocation. And finally, although the focus here will be on well-learned reactions (e.g., adult behavior), I will consider evidence on aggression among children when relevant.

Gender Differences in Aggression

It is necessary , first, to describe briefly what is known about gender differences in the level of aggression. This is necessary because of the almost universal but mistaken belief that girls and women are "normally" nonaggressive or, at the least, consistently less aggressive than boys and men.

It is true that, in the United States, men are more often observed to be aggressive than women. This is true whether we are talking about laboratory studies, or crime rates, or observations of adults or children in the field. (See, e.g., Lefkowitz, Eron, Walder & Huesman, 1977; Frodi, Macaulay & Thome, 1977; Gelles, 1977; McIntyre & Teevan, 1972; Uniform Crime Reports, Federal Bureau

of Investigation, annual.)

But this generalization states only the averages and falls far short of telling the whole stroy, for women are capable of all kinds of aggression and men are sometimes consistently pacific. An anthropologist, Ronald Rohner (1976), analyzed a worldwide sample of communities described by ethnographers and found the expected gender differences only for children in most cultures. In the majority (ours being an exception), adult women and men are equally pacific or aggressive.

Even in our own relatively violent culture we can find areas of equality in aggressiveness. For example, in marital conflict there are apparently many more chronic wife beaters than husband beaters (Gelles, 1974). At the same time, wives have been shown to be as aggressive as husbands in many kinds of marital conflict (Gelles, 1977; Maurer, 1972; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1976; Young, Korner, Gill & Beier, 1975). Presumably it is men's usual advantage of physical size and knowledge of weapons that makes wife battering and murder more common than husband battering and murder, not the desire to batter, as is suggested by Wolfgang's (1957) finding that victim-precipitated spouse murders are more often committed by wives than by husbands.

More impressively, mothers are at least as abusive to children as fathers are, and often more violently so (Gecas & Nye, 1974; Gelles, 1973, 1974, 1977; Gil, 1970; Radbill, 1974; Smith, 1975). Mothers are with their children much more and have more responsi-

bility for them than fathers in most families, of course, but allowing for this factor does not alter the fact that child battering by mothers is a serious problem. What we know about this problem suggests that the circumstances leading to child abuse are much more complex for mothers than for fathers. (See Smith, 1975, for a thorough review of available data.) The picture that emerges from the literature also suggests that mother rage (not maternal psychopathology) has as much significance for society as mother love, and that any effort to deal with violence in our society will have to include a search for the causes of angry motherhood.

Turning to the experimental literature, an extensive review by Frodi et al. (1977) of gender differences in adult aggression shows women to be more aggressive than usually assumed. In over half the studies uncovered, women were as aggressive as men--seldom more so, but rather often equally so. This fact had not been recognized in any previous major discussions or reviews of aggression research, presumably because of the overwhelming weight of the stereotypic view of women as nonaggressive. A great proportion of aggression research has not involved female subjects (McKenna & Kessler, 1977), or if it did, "sex differences" were expected to appear and to need no explanation. When differences did not appear, contrary to expectation, the explanation followed along the lines of "the exception that proves the stereotype." Only in a few discussions of aggression among children does one find any serious consideration of the possibility that girls could

or would act aggressively if they felt free to do so. However it is clear from existing experimental and sociological data that aggression is part of many women's behavioral repertory, gender differences in average level notwithstanding.

The Socialization of Pacifism versus Aggression

This is not to say that gender roles do not affect women's reactions to provocation; they clearly do. Many women's responses to provocation can be fully understood only in light of the view that aggression by women has been considered unbecoming and perhaps even unhealthy (Frodi et al., 1977).

Many observers have noted that parents and teachers encourage girls to be pacific and even passive and boys to be aggressive and assertive (cf. Kagan, 1964). While aggression may be negatively sanctioned for children of both sexes, it is believed to be seriously discouraged only among girls. "Boys will be boys," we say, and sometimes show pride in our male children's toughness while labeling the same behavior as nasty when displayed by girls. The direct evidence for socialization for or away from aggressiveness is mixed (Frodi et al., 1977), but the weight of the data tends to support the hypothesis. (See, especially, a recent study by Atkinson & Endsley, 1976.) O'Leary (1977) pointed out some rather compelling, if indirect, evidence for it. While some studies show boys' aggression to be punished more than girls', boys are less likely to be anxious about being aggressive. Also, the punishment often seems to be ineffective--or even reinforcing (Serbin, O'Leary, Kent & Tonick, 1975). It may be that many studies of punishment for aggression miss some substantial communication in its manner of

delivery, one which increases girls' anxiety but allays that of boys', perhaps through some "boys will be boys" message. Or perhaps the more frequent physical punnishment given to boys teaches them more about anxiety-free aggression than about being good boys (Douvan & Withey, 1955, 1956; McLeod, Atkin & Chaffee, 1972a, 1972b). Complex results obtained such as those by Sears (1961) support the view that our children do receive clear, if sometimes indirect, communication about gender roles in aggression.

When we turn to other socializing agents--the media--we find less ambiguity in the message. Until recently, television has presented its audience almost exclusively with models for male aggression (McArthur & Eisen, 1976; Sternglanz & Serbin, 1974). Gerbner (1972) pointed out that <u>if</u> female television characters <u>do</u> behave aggressively, they almost never get away with it, unlike male characters. Not surprisingly, then, the relationship between television viewing and aggressiveness has been shown to be different for girls and boys (Hartnagel, Teevan & McIntyre, 1975), with male aggressiveness most strongly related to television viewing for boys (Lefkowitz et al., 1977).

The strongest evidence for the differential socialization thesis comes from observation of the end results. First, a variety of evidence supports the view that women are not expected to be either the doers or receivers[1] of aggression (Frodi et al., 1977; Miller, Gillen, Schenker, & Radlove, 1974)--battered wives and rape targets apparently are allowed as exceptions to this norm, at least by men. Women who were somewhat aggressive when younger, and so who have probably had this norm well emphasized for them, are least aggressive as adults (Kagan & Moss, 1962) and may suffer more from stress-related physical problems (Douvan & Locksley, 1977; see also Lefkowitz

et al., 1977). A further curious bit of indirect evidence for the prohibition of aggressive behavior by women is provided by Bugental, Love and Gianetto's (1971) study of smiling by parents interacting with their children. Fathers smile when they are saying pleasant things but women may smile at their children even when saying unfriendly, disapproving or inconsiderate things. Perhaps women try to cover negative feelings about their verbal aggressiveness by trying to look nonaggressively feminine (cf., Hochschild, 1975).

Second, one would predict that feminine women will be less aggressive than nonfeminine or masculine women. Frodi et al. (1977) report that controlling for femininity or masculinity in studies of aggression did not always have the expected effects, although findings were more often than not in the expected direction. However, the gender role measures used in these studies were based on the untenable assumption that femininity/masculinity is a single, bipolar dimension. Presumably better measures of stereotype femininity or masculinity would yield clearer evidence that gender role conformity affects aggressiveness.

A third line of evidence concerning the influence of gender role norms on aggressiveness shows that women and girls become more or less aggressive as the salience of relevant norms varies (Bandura, 1973; Frodi et al., 1977; Larwood, O'Neal & Brennan, 1977; Lowery, Snyder & Denney, 1976; Martin, Gelfand & Hartman, 1971).[2] For example, Lowery et al. found that a woman who has been verbally attacked by a man is expected to respond more aggressively than a man attacked by a woman or a man or woman attacked by a woman. Larwood et al. found women to be less aggressive in an experiment run by a man

than one run by a woman, presumably because the presence of a man underscores their proper gender role more than the presence of a woman.

Finally, there is a related hypothesis concerning gender roles that states that judgment of some behavior is affected by sex of the actor. Behavior labeled as admirable "assertiveness" or seen as acceptable aggression by males is seen as out-of-bounds aggression in females (Feinblatt & Gold, 1976; Frodi et al., 1977; Johnson, 1976; Wolman & Frank, 1975). Some experimental evidence concerning the effect of gender norms on judgments of behavior suggests that such judgments may be subject to complex contrast or assimilation effects, depending on stereotype expectations and situational factors (Bell, 1974; Lowery et al., 1976; Mai-Dalton & Feldman-Summers, 1977). However, the general situation is much as described in a recent Avon advertisement in McCalls (August, 1976): "I'm not the aggressive type," says the feminine looking model, "I thought I'd need a salesman's personality to be out selling Avon. Not true at all. I do fine just being myself." As many commentators have noted, the norm reflected in the Avon ad can pose serious problems for women who are ambitious and achievement oriented and who act accordingly. The Avon saleswoman is right; she will have problems if she behaves like a salesman—but of course she'll also fail if she does not push her products on people and assert their value.

Furthermore, the net effect of sex role norms may be that aggression and self-assertion may be interpreted and reacted to as a social or personality problem differentially according to the person's sex. For example, Bardwick (1971) believes that dependency

may be seen as aggression if coming from a girl but not from a boy, and several studies have shown that men (but not women) with traditional attitudes toward women are more aggressive to women whose behavior or appearance is nonfeminine (Kaleta, 1974; Kaleta & Buss, 1973; Taylor & Smith, 1974; Young, Beier, Beier & Barton, 1975). Generally, unacceptable assertiveness or aggressiveness among females in our society is felt to involve an internal problem (like "bitchiness"), the solution to which is basic personality change, through therapy if necessary (Costrich et al., 1975; Feinblatt & Gold, 1977; see also Bardwick, 1971; Block, 1973; Chesler, 1972; Sherman, 1971; Storr, 1968; Toby, 1974). In contrast, excessive aggressivness among males seems to be felt to involve a problem of excessively strong reactions to provocation, with the assumption that some aggression is normal and even desirable. To try to gentle males, in fact, may even be harmful (cf. Storr, 1968; Tiger, 1971; and the movie The Clockwork Orange), since their unmet aggressive needs could result in explosive catharsis (cf. Bandura & Walters, 1974).

Women's Responses To Provocation

One effect of our society's gender role norms has been the neglect of women in research and theory on human aggression noted above. Another source of this neglect is the common theoretical assumption of an implicitly normal connection between frustration, anger, and aggression. Much of the literature has dealt with issues of when frustration does or does not lead to aggression, whether angry people can or cannot "cathart" their aggressive urges, and the importance of the experience of arousal or recognition of anger or awareness of aggressive cues as necessary mediators between provocation and actual aggressive behavior. If we believe that women

are seldom aggressive, then it must be relatively hard to frustrate or anger them and thus women have only a minor place in all this theorizing. But presumably theorists would not really argue that women experience little frustration or anger in life. How then do women respond to provocation and anger if not always in ways that researchers have labeled aggressive? Some answers to this question can be derived from existing experimental and clinical data. I will present some of them in the form of scripts which will, I hope, not be added to our present stock of stereotypes about women but rather enlarge the total picture of human reactions to provocation.

What Makes Women Angry?

There are probably categorical differences in what makes women and men angry. Much of contemporary women's expressed or unexpressed anger undoubtedly stems from perception of their position in the social order--from oppression, depersonalization, identification with the aggressor, and from the gaps between ideology and reality in the arenas of employment, marriage, motherhood, etc. Presumably when men are in a similar position, they too experience anger. Clinicians can verify that the experiences of oppression and discrimination are common sources of anger among minority men as they are among women generally.

A more complex theoretical question is whether gender role socialization results in reactions to specific provocations and cues for aggression that are qualitatively different for women and men. Frodi (1977) asked psychology students what kinds of behavior from their peers made them most angry. Condescending

treatment by either sex was most commonly mentioned by women. In contrast, men mentioned condescending treatment by women and physical or verbal aggression from men. Frodi's results for other types of provocations, while not significant within the forced choice format, suggest other differences such as lack of efficiency (for women) and lack of sensitivity (for men). Somewhat similarly, Novaco (1975) reported that men say they are made most angry by physical aggression and women by unfair treatment.

When we turn to experimental studies of aggression using only a single form of provocation, we find very few reports of gender differences in anger, possibly because failure to make all subjects equally angry would be counted as total failure for the study. Among published studies it appears that personal insult, criticism and unfair treatment (such as giving excessive shocks) make women and men equally angry. However one exception to this generalization stands out: Matarazzo (1954) had 33% of his female subjects refuse to continue after being criticized for their TAT stories, while no male subjects at all refused to continue. In addition, as Frodi et al. (1977) describe, women seem to be less irritable in crowded places than men. (See also Baum & Koman, 1976; Baxter & Deanovich, 1970; Dabbs, 1971; Efran & Cheyne, 1974; Rule & Nesdale, 1976; Worchel & Teddie, 1976; two studies did not yield gender differences in mixed sex groups: McClelland, 1976; Walton, Humphrey, Foran & Sloan, 1975.)

These results as a whole suggest that the Frodi

and Novaco studies reflect variations in reaction to provocation that are not picked up by the anger measures used in most (reported) experimental studies, or are masked by demand characteristics. In short, as yet we know little about gender--or individual--variation in what constitutes provocation to aggression for humans.

Cues For Aggression

A similar statement can be made about our knowledge of cues for aggression. We can safely assume that some cues reliably connote aggression for some people--a loaded gun, for example. But as Fraczek and Macaulay (1970) showed, for other people this can be a cue for anxiety. Frodi et al. (1977) review some complex gender differences in reactions to cues that also suggest that cue properties are not normative but rather vary significantly with the perceiver. For example, some cues make some women more aggressive when not angered and men more aggressive when angered (Frodi et al., 1977; but see also Harris, 1976; Klosterman, 1973).

The complexity of these results undoubtedly stems in part from the complex nature of learning cue meanings. For example, women have more and different experiences with chopping knives than with guns and, not surprisingly then, women tend to react differently to knives as cues than men do (Frodi et al., 1977). Also women kill more often with knives than with guns, unlike men (Wolfgang, 1961). Generally, if real-life and television experience with aggression is gender-related, then the learning of aggressive cues should be less broad for women than for men.

Furthermore, the interpretation of aggressive cues may follow a different course in women and men, not only because of the association of anger with anxiety (as will be described below), but

also

because cues to aggression also lead to anticipatory empathy (Hoffman, 1977). Frodi (in press) had angered women and men describe what was going through their heads after being angered--in the context of describing mentation while doing a signal detection task. This exercise decreased women's physiological arousal and aggressiveness in a subsequent teaching task to levels shown by controls but increased men's aggressiveness. Unfortunately, sex of subject is confounded here with differential role evocation since the women had female partners and a male experimenter while men had male partners and a female experimenter. (Women are commonly aggressed against less by both women and men, and experimenter sex evokes different role prescriptions, as described by Frodi et al., 1977, and Rumenik, Capasso & Hendrick, 1977.) The results, however, are suggestive of how women might talk themselves out of anger after being provoked.

Other evidence also suggests, contrary to stereotype, that women are less likely than men to generalize hostility to others who are merely nearby as available targets (Bleda, 1976). As Bleda points out, his results fit well with data showing that women are better able than men to distinguish love and liking. This could be paralleled by a relatively weak tendency for women to perceive ambiguous cues as cues for aggression.

In general, then, it is clear that the relationship between available cues (internal as well as external) and reactions to provocation is not simple but will eventually be described adequately only in terms of person, provocation and situation characteristics. We cannot go far beyond this generalization at present.

Aggression Anxiety

Perhaps all anger is accompanied by some anxiety, as Rothenberg (1971) has argued, because it arises when needs or threats are intense and because it signals to most people the advent of a state of vulnerability or loss. However, women more than men are made anxious about their anger, fearful of losing control over their actions and of appearing vulnerable, and anticipatorily guilty or empathic with their potential target.[3] Thus the factor of aggression anxiety must have a major role in any discussion of women's reactions to provocation.

Aggression anxiety is negatively related to actual aggression displayed (for both sexes), and women who have been aggressive are more likely to show anxiety reactions and less likely to show tension reduction than men are (Frodi et al., 1977). Women with high needs for approval (Fishman, 1965) or high aggression anxiety are particularly unlikely to experience tension relief after attacking a provoker (Frodi et al., 1977). Larsen, Martin, Ettinger and Nelson (1976) suggest that the usual measures of "need for approval" actually guage need to avoid disapproval. The Fishman result, then, is probably best understood in light of the existence of general social disapproval of aggression by women. This factor of gender-limited disapproval may also explain why Schill, Rader, Evans and Segall (1976) found hostility guilt to be related to the expected array of defenses (denial, repression, etc.) for men but only to turning-against-self for women. In other words, aggression anxiety among women may be a relatively complex matter, one which is shaped by both internal and social factors.

One final note: it is unlikely that apparent effects of aggression anxiety merely reflect fear of retaliation (see Hoffman, 1977,

p. 719), although this may be a factor which keeps women's--and many men's--aggression within bounds or turns it into indirect forms.

Aggression-turned-inward. Clinicians who have studied depression and suicidal behavior have proposed that anger is one major source of such problems (Bart, 1975; Chesler, 1972; Klinger, 1974; Radloff, 1975; Schless, Mendels, Kipperman, & Cochrane, 1974; Weissman & Paykel, 1974). Women more than men are prone to depression and to attempt suicide (Weissman & Klerman, 1977). Such observations have led clinicians to propose that not only do women typically tend to experience anxiety when angered, but also that many women try to deny that they are angry or to resist recognition of external sources for the arousal they experience (Bardwick, 1971; Kaplan, 1976).

There is a classic clinical soap opera that describes this process. (See Bardwick, 1971, and Mundy, 1975, for similar scripts.) Female X is thwarted or hurt, and feels emotionally aroused. Anger begins to grow but anxiety and defenses against expressing anger to the provoker also grow. Whether denial of anger and successful muzzling of expression actually occur or not, the anxiety may lead to guilt feelings or even to perception of the arousal state as a guilt experience. The "guilty" Female X then begins to discount external causes of her arousal in favor of alleged internal causes such as her own aggressive fantasies, her own insensitivity to the needs and feelings of others, her own unconscious motivation, and various other kinds of personality failures which, she feels, might have led her to provoke the external event that originally began to make her angry. She experiences feelings of hope-

lessness, helplessness, and powerlessness (Seligman, 1975); she feels her problems are probably all her fault and she sees no way to do anything about them (Mandler, 1975). In short, she becomes angry with herself.

A common term for this process is, of course, aggression-turned-inward. It appears to the outside observer to be depression marked by self-recrimination and helpless attribution of failure and misfortune to internal rather than external causes. The apparent paradox of depression marked by both helplessness and self-blame probably reflects the actual paradoxical nature of this state (Abramson & Sackheim, 1977). The depression may appear mild or it may be so severe as to obviously incapacitate the sufferer. Either way, the process does not lead to behavior designed directly to end the provocation that led to the anger nor to repair the damage to self done by an attack. Instead it may lead to behavior which constitutes a further personal problem--impaired daily functioning, excessive drug use, suicide attempts, or actual suicide.

The classic script has Female X expressing anger only inward, but studies of depressed women have suggested that at least some will be aware of anger and express it in general hostility toward the world or even to the original provoker of their anger, although not necessarily in direct, obviously aggressive ways (Atkinson & Polivy, 1976; Cantor, 1976; Roth & Kubal, 1975; Weissman & Paykel, 1974). Note the distinction between general hostility and aggression (cf. Manning & Taylor, 1975). The expression of general hostility lets the provoker or the world in general know that the victim is hurt or angry. This may have subtle aggressive effects, as will be discussed below, but it is not obviously retaliatory aggression.

This is not necessarily the end of the soap opera, at least as long as suicide attempts do not result in death. Female X's aggression-turned-inward may have some important secondary gain for her. As several writers have suggested, the suicide attempter gets help of the type that she could not have gotten without the acquisition of clear personal problems (Cantor, 1976; Chesler, 1972). That is, if Female X had become aware of her anger and acted on it, she might have only gained for herself the label of complainer, bitch, ball-buster, etc. But by becoming an alcoholic or a nearly incapacitated deppressive, she can ask for professional help, and with such help might finally be freed to communicate with others the fact that she is suffering serious hurt, deprivation, etc., and to devise ways to do something about it. Maris (1971) has called this "deviance as therapy." His analyses support the view that some sexual "deviance," drug abuse, and suicide attempts can be seen as coping mechanisms used by women to help preserve rather than to cripple or end life.

We cannot say with certainty whether this script is frequent in real life nor whether the central figures is relatively often female. There is some scattered evidence that supports such generalizations however. Extrapolation from some findings by Miller et al. (1974) suggests that women who predict that they would not be aggressive in a Milgram obedience situation would also ascribe responsibility for their behavior (benign or hurtful) to themselves rather than to the experimenter who is pushing aggressiveness. Clifton and Lee (1976), studying self report reactions to hypothetical situations, found evidence

that women are particularly likely to use such a script to describe their behavior. Women in a study by Bogo, Winget and Gleser (1970) had higher scores than men for turning-against-self on a defense mechanisms inventory. (No gender difference was found for projection or hypothetical turning-against-others, although men reported more actual turning-against-others.) Schill et al. (1976) found that aggression-turned-inward and expression of hostility outward are more likely to co-occur in women than in men, with men's responses conforming more to the original classic script which had aggression-turned-inward co-occuring with inhibition of hostility expressed outward. Other studies have found that the angry, depressed woman suffers from an inability to communicate her anger openly and directly (Cantor, 1976; Weissman & Paykel, 1974)--note that the latter results do not contradict Schill et al.'s findings if we make a distinction between expression of hostility and communication of particular grievances. As noted before, depression is often intimately connected with anger, and women are, more often than men, depressives and suicide attempters (but not actual suicides; Monk, 1975). Gold (1958) claimed that women tend to "choose suicide over murder as their preferred form of aggression." That is, although there are more male suicides in absolute numbers, there are proportionally more female suicides as a percentage of all female killings. Analysis of alcoholism among women is not well advanced (Johnson & Garzon, 1977), so we have little evidence either way supporting the inclusion of alcoholics and drug abusers in this script. Marlatt, Kosturn and Lang (1975) have data, however, that suggest both women and men drink more when their anger is unexpressed.

Anger defined as "hurt" and counteraggression. The classic (or perhaps stereotypic) script of aggression-turned-inward is

apparently not the only script open to the person suffering from aggression anxiety. Another script can be derived from popular plots. This script stars the stock female who says, "I'm not angry, I'm just hurt," and who then proceeds to try to exact a penalty of guilt from her provokers by dwelling on her suffering and making them aware of it. The "hurt" aggressor can hide the retaliatory nature of her behavior from herself, not believing, of course, that one as powerless as she has any capacity to really retaliate. For example, one's mate can be cursed with, "I know you never really loved me; I wish I were dead" (cf. Symonds, 1976). The clinical literature offers a rich collection of variations on this script, with plots centering around criticism, carping, sadness, hopelessness, hand-wringing, whining, self-righteousness, martyrdom, etc. (See for example Steiner's transactional analysis of scripts, 1974; Symond's catalogue of female patients who "hurt," 1976; Bach & Goldberg, 1974; Bloom, Coburn & Pearlman, 1975; Mundy, 1975.)

An experimental study by Buvinic (1975) offers an illustration of how the development of such scripts might be encouraged. In this study angered women and men were told to focus either on their feelings or to express opinions about the character of their provoker. Women, unlike men, tended to see themselves as feeling "hurt" rather than "angry" when focussing on their feelings. Women in all conditions were subsequently inhibited in expressing verbal aggression when face-to-face with their provoker but in a paper and pencil evaluation expressed more negative views than men generally or women not given the chance to concentrate on their feelings.

Variables of awareness and justification of hostile behavior

are probably important here. That is, angry or "hurt" women plagued with aggression anxiety behave more aggressively if they can avoid awareness of the quality of their behavior or if they can find some prosocial justification for it (Frodi et al., 1977). In a study by Feshbach, Stiles and Bitter (1967), insulted women were given a sentence completion task and every time they used selected pronouns their tormenter, apparently by chance, received an electric shock. Women characterized by both high aggression anxiety and non-awareness of the contingency showed a significant increase in the use of these pronouns, unlike aware or low anxiety women. Gollob and Levine (1967) found that their women subjects on the whole enjoyed aggressive humor less if their attention was focussed on its aggressivity. Similarly, Rule, Nesdale and Dyck (1975) found that fostering awareness of the aggressiveness of elicited behavior lowered its intensity, while Carver (1974, 1975) got reverse results by increasing women's awareness of aggression that was positively valued.

There are a number of truly aggressive responses open to women starring in this script which researchers have not systematically examined. They fall under the rubric "passive aggression," a behavior well known to the clinician (cf. Mundy, 1975). In addition to seeking the guilt penalty directly, the hurt female can torment others as well as herself with self-destructive behavior. The alcoholic's family, for example, pays along with the alcoholic. In mild versions of this behavior the angered wife may do things like neglect to cook her mate's favorite dinner when expected to, or worse yet, cook it when the mate expects nothing because he has just attacked her.

Open Aggression By Women

As noted above, women are often found to act on their anger by open, other-directed aggression. Alternative scripts relatively often enacted by women can be derived from exploration of factors that differentiate studies showing gender differences from those that do not (cf., Frodi et al., 1977).

One kind of study which does not produce gender differences concerns situations in which the potentially aggressive subject is anonymous or "deindividuated." In Zimbardo's (1969) studies, subjects were literally cloaked in anonymity, with hoods that showed only their eyes. The results from these and related studies suggest that when women are with other women and when they are unidentifiable, they will behave as aggressively as men (Frodi et al., 1977; Penner & Hawkins, 1971). The explanation of these results may rest in the perception by these women that their anonymity temporarily releases them from gender role requirements, with the presence of other anonymous women in the same situation acting as a guarantee that this is a reliable perception.

This speculative explanation is similar to one, for which there is more support, offered by Frodi et al. (1977) for lack of gender differences in most studies involving justified aggression. In these studies justification is given explicitly or implicitly to both women and men and details that might arouse anxiety, empathy for the victim, fear of retaliation and--most importantly for women --evocation of gender role requirements are absent.

These details are easily arranged in experimental situations. The typical experimenter has only subjects and confederates who

are strangers to each other. Empathy is avoided by preventing contact between subjects and would-be victims. It is harder to control anxiety arousal but this can be done by presenting the situation as one in which good subjects, female or male, perform as expected--that is, aggressively. Subjects may or may not be aware that the behavior called for might be said to be aggressive.[4] They may only see themselves as doing what they have been asked to do, squeamishly perhaps, but with more or less intensity, as a soldier kills for his country. If the experimenter's deception works, they will not be aware that the experimenter is actually measuring the aggressiveness of their behavior. In fact, increasing self-awareness (through provision of a mirror so that subjects are very aware of themselves as they progress through the experiment) can heighten justified aggressiveness (Carver 1974, 1975). Evocation of gender roles can be merely avoided by these experimental arrangements, or the situation can be engineered to demonstrate directly that they are suspended, commonly by modeling female aggressiveness or male aggression against women.

When this battery of justifications is strong, it can result in finding women behaving strikingly more aggressive than men. Sheridan and King (1972), for example, found that all their female subjects were willing to shock a live, squealing puppy to the limit allowed. In contrast, some men refused to go that far. Zimbardo (1969) describes a pilot study that remained a pilot study when he found he might not be able to control his female subjects' aggression. In this study "deindividuated" (hooded) women were supposedly helping the experimenter train people who

wanted to learn the art of passive resistance to others' aggression. The subjects' play acting was literally stunning and the "training" had to be abruptly ended before physical injury was done.

A parallel situation can be found outside the laboratory in the justification some abusive parents give for beating their children--it's all for their own good and necessary in order to get the best results (Blumberg, 1974; Gelles, 1974, 1977). The cultural adage of "spare the rod and spoil the child"is used not only to justify a mild spanking but also for acts which seem to some outside observers to be clearly injurious to the child.

One is reminded here of women's reputation in literature and folklore for sudden fury and unpredictable anger. For example, some newspaper stories on women police in squad cars have claimed that wrong-doers fear them more than male police because they believe that these women will not be restrained in gun use. The same stereotype exists in psychological literature. McLeod et al.(1974a) state it quite clearly: "The conceptual definition [of irritability] offered by Buss, 'a readiness to explode at the slightest provocation . . . including quick temper, grouchiness, exasperation, and rudeness,' certainly fits the female stereotype." If this reputation has some basis in actual behavior it is a phenomenon which needs explaining. A hydraulic analogy suggests itself: women with pent-up rage tend to boil over. Julia Sherman (personal communication) has suggested another explanation: women have not had socialization for open aggression. Thus when aggression seems justified or when women do not feel bound by gender role prohibitions, some women show a lack of ability to monitor or moderate

their behavior. This learning deficiency, if that is what it is, may also explain part of the bewilderment men are said to experience when interacting with angry women. Men's customary tactics for coping with male adversaries who abide by male rules might not work well in situations where the adversary has other rules or knows no rules at all.

Response Preference

It is commonly believed that women are not physically aggressive for inborn, constitutional reasons. If women get angry, they supposedly use verbal or symbolic forms of aggression, perhaps on substitute targets, or at least act in indirect and sneaky ways (Bardwick, 1971; Feshbach, 1970). The stereotype dish-flinging or face-slapping wife or jealous hair-pulling rivals, etc., are not consistent with this assumption, but then folk psychology abounds in contradictions. The review by Frodi et al. (1977) did not uncover any definitive tests of these assumptions. Strong physical aggression is not studied in the laboratory, for obvious reasons. Women were found to be as aggressive as men in a few studies which involved hitting others with foam bats, an action which might give the subject the illusion of being physically aggressive although the target is not physically hurt (Maurer, 1973; Young et al., 1975b). Only one study was found which provides indirect evidence that women avoid physical aggression because it is physical. Lando (1976) found that women were less aggressive than men when provoked by and retaliating with electric shock. When provocation and retaliation consisted of material punishment (monetary fines), women and men both fully reciprocated at the level of punishment reveived. However, many other studies have found

women quite willing to use electric shock. Also, a study by Hymer and Atkins (1973) failed to find that women with traditional attitudes toward women were more aversive to physical aggression and more prone to verbal or indirect aggression than women with positive attitudes toward women's liberation. The studies reviewed by Frodi et al. similarly fail to show women to be more verbally aggressive than men, either in absolute levels or proportionally, or to use substitute targets more.

In short, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions from the experimental literature about women's supposedly inherent tendencies to be verbally rather than physically aggressive when angry. We can note on one hand that females don't seem to get into physical fights as often as males at any age. This cannot be explained by reference to average female-male size differences (causing women to shun physical fights because they would lose them) since these differences are very small among preadolescent children. On the other hand we should note that women at least as often as men physically abuse children who are smaller and seldom able to fight back effectively, this, however, could reflect status differences, not size differences (cf. Hochschild, 1975).

A study by Donnenworth and Foa (1974) suggests a way of looking at this question of response choice that may help close the gap between what is generally believed and what the evidence shows. Their hypothesis, supported by their data from women, is that angry people prefer to retaliate in kind when hurt by another. If they can't, and if substitute retaliation is possible, then the latter will be more intense than in-kind retaliation would have been. It was noted above that women may be made angry by different things than men. If so, and if we all resort to substitute modes of

retaliation at times, this could lead to observable gender differences in aggressive style and intensity.

In addition, there is some suggestive evidence that women evaluate various modes of aggression differently than men--and than aggression researchers. That is, women and men differ in what they see as more and less mean ways of retaliating when provoked. At the extremes, probably everyone is in agreement: A stabbing is more serious than personal insult. Women and men are almost equally negative in their attitudes toward violence (Frodi et al., 1977). But when it comes to forms of aggression that would not be termed violence, it may be that women, for example, judge a blow to the ego to be more serious than a slap in the face. Women who have been ignored in a conversation rate themselves as anxious, frustrated, nervous, etc. and are subsequently less positive about and generous with their provoker than women in a control condition (Geller, Goodstein, Silver & Sternberg, 1974). The belief that females tend to have relatively strong affiliative needs and so are more threatened by potential rejection has been stated in a variety of contexts (cf., O'Leary, 1974; Stein & Bailey, 1973; Unger, 1976). Pauline Thome (personal communication) has suggested that, in fact, many women use nonresponse or withdrawl as a form of aggression--and view such behavior as direct, not passive aggression. Three studies report finding that women with a choice of responses after being shocked or insulted seem to prefer to ignore the provoker rather than to retaliate in kind (Landau, Packer & Levy, Note 2; Rule, Nesdale & Dyck, 1975; Unger, DeMauro & Imbrognio, Note 3). It may be that these results reflect simple inhibition of response or avoidance of the situation, or it may be

that these women were expressing their anger in a satisfying way. The latter interpretation is supported by two studies showing that women permitted to shock a partner who had unfairly shocked them show continued physiological arousal while women who are simply relieved of contact with their provoker show relief from the attack-induced arousal (Holmes, 1966; Vantress & Williams, 1972). Possibly parallel results for residual hostility after an unfair verbal attack are reported by Atkinson and Polivy 1976. Close examination of results obtained by Hokanson and his colleagues shows a similar pattern (cf. Frodi et al., 1977 and Quanty, 1976, for reviews of the Hokanson results). An apparently contradictory study by Gaebelein (in press) does not show women tending to use a nonresponse option with great frequency. However, the "nonaggressive" option here is not a true "ignore" response but rather a quantitative choice within a continuum probably perceived by subjects as going from friendly to aggressive.

Coping Responses To Provocation

These data on nonresponse to provocation suggest a novel script relatively often enacted by women in response to provocation. There are no classic plots for this script; it is created here from a variety of data in an attempt to put destructive or pathological reactions to provocation in a perspective that includes constructive or healthy coping. The former reactions are a minority; the majority of people are given neither to destructive retaliation nor self-destruction when angry but rather sometimes cope and sometimes have minor problems with their anger. The laboratory studies do not deal in pathology; they are studies usually of average college students. The few subjects who exhibit crazy behavior are dealt with either by exclusion from the sample or statistical "normalization" so their scores don't

skew the averages. Conversely, clinical studies deal with a subsample of the population that is not representative of the person who can cope with anger and depression, etc. Although most research is, understandably, designed to illuminate the dynamics of problem behavior, examination of majority responses in the experimental literature does provide enough data to outline a script for nonproblem behavior.

First, the slowness of the average woman to see aggressivness in ambiguous stimuli (Frodi et al., 1977) suggests that many women are reluctant to see deliberate aggression in others' behavior. Second, the socialization of females away from overt or destructive aggression and into nurturance, etc., means that they not only have little experience in staging successful aggressive retaliation for harm but also that they may have had relatively good training in the toleration of frustration and hurt. And for provocation that could not be tolerated, they may have been able to develop ways of coping that involved neither denial of anger nor the kind of destructive retaliation that leads to the escalation of conflict. Bleda (1976) reports results suggesting that women have a more complex perception of an anger-provoking situation than men. He also found that their anger generalizes less to nonprovoking bystanders. His study suggests that we may find a rational coping script more often among women than men.

The angry woman in this script acknowledges her anger and, when she can, acts to remove the provocation or right the wrong. When remediation is impossible, she asserts control of the situation by removing herself from it or by ignoring the provoker. In addition to the data on nonresponse as an affirmative reaction to provocation, there is evidence that nonresponse may be an effective

control for some aggressiveness--an outcome which would presumably reinforce nonresponse to provocation. (See evidence cited by Berkowitz, 1973, pp. 123-125.)

The key elements in this script may be expression of anger (one way or another), understanding of the complexity of an anger-inducing situation, and the feeling of control. Bohart (1977) demonstrated with female subjects that both insight and expression of anger, achieved in this case through role playing one's own predicament and the provoker's position, are necessary to anger reduction. Nezlek and Brehm (1975) found that mere opportunity to shock an insulting experimenter--a factor that presumably would give one a feeling of control in the situation--was sufficient to lower the victim's hostility.

Nonresponse here is not necessarily the same as denial of anger nor symptomatic of impending martyrdom. The hero in this script can achieve satisfaction akin to that of direct retaliation through a variety of means other than destruction of the enemy. On one hand there is evidence that this average hero is not likely to experience relief through destructive retaliation. Hoffman (1977) presents evidence that empathic people (and more women than men are found to be empathic) would experience vicarious affective arousal of a negative sort should they contemplate seriously hurtful retaliation. Frodi et al. (1977) describe evidence showing that only women characterized by low aggression guilt--presumably a minority--find relief through direct retaliation. On the other hand, there are several studies done in the context of the catharsis hypothesis that suggest that women (and men) can, in some situations,

experience reduction of anger through justified aggression, through witnessing the punishment or humbling of their provoker, or even through enjoying the punishment of some other deserving person as in aggressive humor (Aronson & Cope, 1968; Bramel, Taub & Blum, 1968; Fromkin, Goldstein & Brock, 1977; Kaplan, 1973; Konečni & Ebbesen, 1976; Landy & Mettee, 1969; Leak, 1974; Prerost, 1976; Prerost & Brewer, 1973; Robbins & Tanck, 1969; but see also Berkowitz, 1970; Kaplan, 1975). In addition, just having a good laugh may be enough to reduce the anger level of some women (Baron & Ball, 1974; Mueller & Donnerstein, 1977). The limiting conditions for this experience probabably are the same as those which hold in studies not yielding gender differences: justification of performed or witnessed aggression for both women and men, avoidance of arousal of empathy or aggression anxiety or guilt, and safety from retaliation. Mueller and Donnerstein's results suggest that moderation may be important for humor to have a soothing effect. In their study women's (but not men's) aggression was reduced by exposure to mildly funny, nonhostile humor but not to highly funny, arousing humor.

Scripts for coping with provocation that are found in real life are undoubtedly more complex than that presented here. While the empirical data necessary to refine it are sparse, richer descriptions can be found in other contexts. Bacon (1977) presents several examples drawn from the experiences of pacifist women, and a number of therapists have described the ability of healthy, assertive women to find constructive expression of their anger (Bloom

et al., 1975; Kaplan, 1976a, 1976b; Mundy, 1975). Kaplan states the essence of this script simply: "If anger can be handled reasonably and purposefully, it can then be put aside, leaving one more open to a broader range of human experience" (1976a, p. 358).

A thoughtful analysis of the conceptual confusion of anger with aggression and related concepts by Rothenberg (1971) also includes a script for nonaggressive, nonpathological reaction to provocation. Anger, in this view, can be defined as a state of emotional arousal which results from provocation. It can be differentiated from rage, hate and hostility which involve destructiveness or malevolence in feelings, intentions, or behavior. Anger can have constructive or destructive sequelae. A theory of anger is not the same as a theory of aggression, although awareness of anger may be a necessary antecedent of aggression--many other theorists would agree to this of course. Rothenberg notes:

> "To be sure, both the angry individual and those around [him or her] perceive that attack or destruction is a possible outcome of the angry state, and this is one of the reasons others act. Attack is far from inevitable, however, and it occurs only when verbal communication [of the anger] is not specific to the source of the threat or obstruction, is not sufficient as a motor discharge, does not effect removal of the threat, or is not permitted in the first place because of external or internal restraints . . . (1970, p. 475)."

Another version of the script might be derived from data collected by Eibl-Eibesfeldt (1974) on conflict among the !Ko-Bushpeople. "The culture of these people, he says, "shapes them

according to a peaceful ideal." As peaceful as they seem, however, provocation and aggressive retalitation are not unknown among them. "What is striking about the bushmen," he says, " is not their lack of aggression, but their efficient way of coping with it"--for example, by separating from each other when conflict threatens, by socializing children of both sexes into harmless or controlled modes of aggression (teasing, mocking, wrestling), by means of tension-release games for both children and adults, and by encouraging patterns of bonding which protect them against each other's anger. They are not totally successful in eliminating destructive aggression but on the whole, Eibl-Eibesfeldt believes, their control of aggression is admirably "efficient."

Research Needs

The research approach found in psychology has generally been very different from that used by Eibl-Eibesfeldt. Psychologists have used a model which views destructive aggression as the normal, even innate, male reaction to provocation. This has led to some serious blind spots. For example, there has been much discussion about the relation of punishment to aggression, but almost always in the context of boys who are viewed as normally aggressive (cf., Berkowitz, 1973). Some puzzles in this area might be solved if we examined girls, who are also subject but more successfully so to punishment for aggression. Adult women, on the whole, are somewhat more peaceable than men in our culture. It is important to understand the origins of such peaceableness, as well as the origins of violence if we are ever to learn to control aggression. Our present understanding is based on a narrow range

of subjects, behaviors, and situations and on experimental paradigms in which response alternatives are artificially restricted to clearly aggressive and easily observed responses. Existing studies of aggression among children and nonhuman animals are more broadly based but cannot do more than provide suggestions for the study of the learned behavior of adult humans. It has been the goal of this paper to suggest opening up the study of aggression to the full range of behavior following provocation.

FOOTNOTES

1. In laboratory and observational studies both sexes are usually less aggressive toward females than toward males. Note that this result does not contradict the common belief that women tend to take out their anger at male provokers on handy female targets. There is no experimental evidence either way for this hypothesis. In the laboratory situation what is being compared is aggression directed at original provokers of different sexes with substitute targets of varying sex seldom provided.

2. I have not cited a set of possibly relevant studies by Gaebelein and colleagues (cf. Gaebelein, 1977) because of consistent confounding of sex of responder (a confederate of the experimenter who delivers shocks to a victim at the subject's direction), sex of target, sex of target's director, and sex of subject.

3. Empathy (vicarious affective arousal) has been found both to be more common among women (Hoffman, 1977) than among men and to be associated generally with low aggressiveness in both sexes (Bond & Dutton, 1975; Frodi et al., 1977; Goodwin, 1973). However it remains unclear whether empathic reactions act as a very strong deterrent to aggression by women. Strong empathy may have a double effect: the more one feels the victim's pain, the worse one feels empathically but the better one feels for successful aggression (Swart & Berkowitz, 1977).

4. In some studies of "aggression" the subjects are not even angered. Tedeschi and his colleagues (Kane, Joseph, & Tedeschi, 1976) have argued that only the experimenter defines behavior in these studies as aggression. However, even in studies of apparently justified aggression with nonangered subjects but without controls for arousal of empathy or anxiety, subjects show concern over their own behavior, as if they viewed it as aggression. (See the analysis of the Buss situation presented by Frodi et al., 1977.)

Reference Notes

1. Landau, J. J., Packer, L. E., & Levy, J. Sex and environmental determinants of aggression. Paper presented at the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, August 1973.
2. Walton, D. M., Humphrey, M. F., Foran, M.M., & Sloan, L. R. Intruder's sex, target's sex, dyad relationship, territoriality and personal space. Paper presented at the 83rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, 1975.
3. Unger, R., De Mauro, D., & Imbrognio, L. Sex differences in aggression: It all depends on how you ask. Unpublished paper, Montclair State College, New Jersey, 1977.

References

Abramson, L. Y., & Sackeim, H. A. A paradox in depression: Uncontrollability and self-blame. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 838-851.

Aronson, E., & Cope, V. My enemy is my friend. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 8-12.

Atkinson, C., & Polivy, J. Effects of delay, attack, and retaliation on state depression and hostility. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1976, 85, 570-576.

Atkinson, J., & Endsley, R. C. Influence of sex of child and parent on parental reactions to hypothetical parent-child situations. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1976, 94, 131-148.

Bach, G. R., & Goldberg, H. Creative aggression. New York: Avon, 1974.

Bacon, M. Yeast of a new bread's rising. WIN, March 3, 1977, 9-12.

Bandura, A. Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. Catharsis--A questionable mode of coping with violence. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. H. Straus (Eds.), Violence in the family. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Bardwick, J. The psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Baron, R. A., & Ball, R. L. The aggression-inhibiting influence of nonhostile humor. Journal of Experimantal Social Psychology, 1974, 10, 23-33.

Bart, P. The loneliness of the long-distance mother. In J. Freeman (Ed.), Women: A feminist perspective. Palo Alto, CA: 1975.

Baum, A., & Koman, S. Differential response to anticipated crowding: Psychological effects of social and spatial density. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 526-536.

Baxter, J. C., & Deanovich, B. F. Anxiety arousing effects of inappropriate crowding. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 174-178.

Bell, N. J. Sex of the source and other factors influencing the attribution of aggressiveness to statements. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(7-A), 4401-4402. (University Microfilms No. 73-30,535)

Berkowitz, L. Aggressive humor as a stimulus to aggressive responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 710-717.

Berkowitz, L. Control of aggression. In B. M. Caldwell & H. N. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of child development research, vol. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Bleda, P. R. Conditioning and discrimination of affect and attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1106-1113.

Block, J. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.

Bloom, L. Z., Coburn, K., & Pearlman, J. The new assertive woman. New York: Delacorte Press, 1975.

Blumberg, M. When parents hit out. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus, Violence in the family. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Bogo, N., Winget C., & Gleser, G. C. Ego defenses and perceptual styles. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970, 30, 599-605.

Bohart, A. C. Role playing and interpersonal-conflict reduction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 15-24.

Bond, M. H., & Dutton, D. G. The effect of interaction anticipation and experience as a victim on aggressive behavior. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43, 515-527.

Bramel, D., Taub, B., & Blum, B. An observer's reaction to the suffering of his enemy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 384-392.

Bugental, D. E., Love, L. R., & Gianetto, R. M. Perfidious feminine faces. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 314-318.

Buvenic, M. Sex differences in the aggressive consequences of expressing feelings or opinions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts, 1976, 36, 1498B. (University Microfilms No. 75-12,890).

Cantor, P. C. Personality characteristics found among youthful female suicide attempts. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1976, 85, 324-329.

Carver, C. S. Facilitation of physical aggression through objective self-awareness. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1974, 10, 365-370.

Carver, C. S. Physical aggression as a function of objective self-awareness and attitudes toward punishment. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 510-519.

Chesler, P. Women and madness. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1972.

Clifton, A. K., & Lee, D. E. Self-destructive consequences of sex-role socialization. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 1976, 6, 11-22.

Costrich, N., Feinstein, J.,Kidder, L., Maracek, J., & Pascale, L. When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11, 520-530.

Dabbs, J. M. Physical closeness and negative feelings. Psychonomic Science, 1971, 23, 141-143.

Donnenwerth, G. V., & Foa, U. G. Effect of resource class on retaliation to injustice in interpersonal exchange. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 785-793.

Douvan, E., & Locksley, A. Problem behavior in adolescents. In E. Gomberg & V. Frank (Eds.), Sex differences in disturbed behavior. New York: McGraw Hill, forthcoming.

Douvan, E., & Withey, S. A study of adolescent boys. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1955.

Douvan, E., & Withey, S. A study of adolescent girls. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1956.

Efran, M. G., & Cheyne, J. A. Affective concommitants of the invasion of shared space: Behavioral, physiological, and verbal indicators. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 219-226.

Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. The myth of the aggression-free hunter and gatherer society. In R. L. Holloway (Ed.), Primate aggression, territoriality and xenophobia: A comparative perspective. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Feinblatt, J. A., & Gold, A. R. Sex roles and the psychiatric referral process. Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 109-122.

Feshbach, S., Stiles, W. B., & Bitter, E. The reinforcing effects of witnessing aggression. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1967, 2, 133-139.

Fishman, C. G. Need for approval and the expression of aggression under varying conditions of frustration. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 809-816

Fraçzek, A., & Macaulay, J. R. Some personality factors in reaction to aggressive stimuli. Journal of Personality, 1971, 39, 163-177.

Frodi, A. Sex differences in perception of a provocation: A survey. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1977, 44, 113-114.

Frodi, A. Experiential and physiological responses associated with anger and aggression in women and men. Journal of Research in Personality, in press.

Frodi, A., Macaulay, J., & Thome, P. R. Are women always less aggressive than men? A review of the experimental literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 634-660.

Fromkin, H. L., Goldstein, J. H., & Brock, T. C. The role of "irrelevant" derogation in vicarious aggression catharsis: A field experiment. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1977, 13, 239-252.

Gaebelein, J. W. Sex differences in instigative aggression. Journal of Research in Personality, 1977, forthcoming.

Gaebelein, J. W. Third party instigated aggression as a function of attack pattern and a nonaggressive response option. Journal of Research in Personality, in press.

Gecas, V., & Nye, F. I. Sex and class differences in parent-child interaction: A test of Kohn's hypothesis. Journal of Marriage and The family, 1974, 36, 742-749.

Geller, D. M., Goodstein, L., Silver, M., & Sternberg, W. C. On being ignored: The effects of violations of implicit rules of social interaction. Sociometry, 1974, 37, 541-556.

Gelles, R. J. Child abuse as psychopathology. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 43, 611-621.

Feshbach, S. Aggression. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology. New York: Wiley, 1970.

Gelles, R. J. The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage, 1974.

Gelles, R. J. Violence toward children in the U. S. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Denver, 1977.

Gerbner, G. Violence in television drama: Trends & symbolic functions. In C. A. Comstock & E. A. Rubenstein (Eds.), Television and social behavior vol. 1: Media content and control. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Gil, D. G. Violence against children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Gold, M. Suicide, homicide, and aggression. American Journal of Sociology, 1958, 63, 651-661.

Gollob, H. F., & Levine, J. Distraction as a factor in the enjoyment of aggressive humor. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 368-372.

Goodwin, A. R. The effects of locus of control and feedback cues on behavioral aggression. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(5-A), 2387. (University Microfilms No. 73-27,298)

Harris, M. B. Instigators and inhibitors of aggression in a field experiment. Journal of Social Psychology, 1976, 98, 27-38.

Hartnagel, T. F., Teevan, J. L., & McIntyre, J. J. Television violence and violent behavior. Social Forces, 1975, 54, 341-351.

Hochschild, A. R. The sociology of feeling and emotion: Selected possibilities. In M. Millman & R. M. Kanter (Eds.), Another voice. Garden City, NY: Anchor/Doubleday, 1975.

Hoffman, M. L. Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 712-722.

Holmes, D. Effects of overt aggression on level of physiological arousal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 189-194.

Johnson, P. Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 99-110.

Hymer, S., & Atkins, A. The relationship between attitudes toward the Women's Liberation Movement and mode of aggressive expression in women. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 8, 173-174. (Summary)

Kane, T. R., Joseph, J. M., & Tedeschi, J. T. Person perception and the Berkowitz paradigm for the study of aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 663-673.

Johnson, S., & Garzon, S. R. Women and alcoholism: Past imperfect & future indefinite. Paper presented at the Annual Research Conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, St. Louis, February, 1977.

Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex-typing and sex-role identification. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Kagan, J., & Moss, H. A. Birth to maturity: A study in psychological development. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Kaleta, R. J. Femininity, feminine attitudes, and aggression. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(9-A), 6104-6105. (University Microfilms No. 74-5264)

Kaleta, R. J., & Buss, A. H. Aggression intensity and femininity of the victim. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, May, 1973.

Kaplan, A. G. Androgyny: The model of mental health. In A. G. Kaplan & J. P. Bean, Beyond sex role stereotypes. Boston: Little, Brown, 1976a.

Kaplan, A. G. Clarifying the concept of androgyny: Implications for therapy. Paper presented at the 84th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 1976.

Kaplan, R. M. The cathartic value of attitudinal and counter-attitudinal expression. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1973, 8 277-278.

Kaplan, R. M. The cathartic value of self-expression: Testing, catharsis, dissonance, and interference explanations. Journal of Social Psychology, 1975, 97, 195-208.

Klinger, E. Consequences of commitment to and disengagement from incentives. Psychological Review, 1974, 82, 1, 1-25.

Klosterman, D. F. Weapons as aggressive cues. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(5-B), 2286. (University Microfilms 73-25,457)

Konečni, V. J., & Ebbesen, E. B. Disinhibition versus the cathartic effect: Artifact and substance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 352-365.

Lando, H. A. Sex differences in response to differing patterns of attack. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1976, 2, 286-289.

Landy, D., & Mettee, D. Evaluation of an aggressor as a function of exposure to cartoon humor. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 66-71.

Larsen, K. S., Martin, H. J., Ettinger, R. H., & Nelson, J. Approval seeking, social cost and aggression: A scale and some dynamics. Journal of Psychology, 1976, 94, 3-11.

Larwood, L., O'Neal, E., & Brennan, P. Increasing the physical aggressiveness of women. Journal of Social Psychology, 1977, 101, 97-101.

Leak, G. K. Effects of hostility arousal and aggressive humor on catharsis and humor preference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 736-740.

Lefkowitz, M. M., Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Huesman, L. R. Growing up to be violent. Pergamon Press, 1977.

Leventhal, H. The emotions: A basic problem in social psychology. In C. Nemeth (Ed.), Social Psychology. Chicago: Markham , 1973.

Lowery, C. R., Snyder, C. R., & Denney, N. W. Perceived aggression and perceived counteraggression as a function of sex of dyad participants: When males and females exchange verbal blows. Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 339-346.

Mai-Dalton, R. R., & Feldman-Summers, S. Are angry women more acceptable than angry men? Paper presented at the 85th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1977.

Mandler, G. Mind and emotion. New York: Wiley, 1975

Manning, S. A., & Taylor, D. A. Effects of viewed violence and aggression: Stimulation and catharsis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 180-188.

Maris, R. W. Deviance as therapy: The paradox of the self-destructive female. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1971, 12, 113-124.

Marlatt, G. A., Kosturn, C. F., & Lang, A. R. Provocation to anger and opportunity for retaliation as determinants of alcohol consumption in social drinkers. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1975, 84, 652-659.

Martin, M. F., Gelfand, D. M., & Hartmann, D. P. Effect of adult and peer observers on boys' and girls' responses to an aggressive model. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1271-1275.

Matarazzo, J. D. An experimental study of aggression in the hypertensive patient. Journal of Personality, 1954, 22, 423-447.

Maurer, C. D. The effects of sex, parental status, and relationship of opponent on physical aggression and hostility of married subjects. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 4518B. (University Microfilms No. 73-6627)

McArthur, L. Z., & Eisen, S. V. Television and sex-role stereotyping. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1976, 6, 329-351.

McClelland, L. Interaction level and acquaintance as mediators of density effects. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1976, 2, 175-178.

McIntyre, J. S., & Teevan, J. J. Television and deviant behavior. In G. A. Comstock & E. A. Rubenstein (Eds.), Television and social behavior, vol. 3. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1972.

McKenna, W., & Kessler, S. J. Experimental design as a source of sex bias in social psychology. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 117-128.

McLeod, J. M., Atkin, C. K., & Chaffee, S. H. Adolescents, parents, and television use: Adolescent self-report measures from the Maryland and Wisconsin samples. In G. A. Comstock & E. A. Rubenstein (Eds.), Television and social behavior, ol. 3. Government Printing Office, 1972.

McLeod, J. M., Atkin, C. K., & Chaffee, S. H. Adolescents, parents, and television use: Self-report and other-report measures from the Wisconsin sample. In G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubenstein (Eds.), Television and social behavior, vol. 3. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Miller, A. G., Gillen, B., Schenker, C., & Radlove, S. The prediction and perception of obedience to authority. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 23-42.

Monk, M. Epidemiology. In S. Perlin (Ed.), A handbook for the study of suicide. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Mueller, C., & Donnerstein, E. The effects of humor-induced arousal upon aggressive behavior. Journal of Research in Personality, 1977, 11, 73-82.

Mundy, J. Women in rage: A psychological look at the helpless heroine. In R. Unger & F. Denmark (Eds.), Women: Dependent or independent variable? New York: Psychological Dimensions, 1975.

Radloff, L. Sex differences in depression: The effects of occupation and marital status. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 249-266.

Nezlek, J., & Brehm, J. W. Hostility as a function of the opportunity to counteraggress. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43, 421-433.

Novaco, R. W. Anger control. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1975.

O'Leary, V. Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, 809-826.

O'Leary, V. Toward understanding women. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1977.

Penner, L. A., & Hawkins, H. L. The effects of visual contact and aggressor identification on interpersonal aggression. Psychonomic Science, 1971, 24, 261-263.

Prerost, F. J. Reduction of aggression as a function of related content of humor. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 771-777.

Prerost, F. J., & Brewer, R. E. The choice of humor after aggression arousal: A search for relief. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1973, 8, 187-188.

Quanty, M. B. Aggression catharsis: Experimental investigations and implications. In R. G. Geen & E. C. O'Neal (Eds.), Perspectives on aggression. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Radbill, S. K. A history of child abuse and infanticide. In R. E. Helfer & H. Kempe (Eds.), The battered child, revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Robbins, P. R., & Tanck, R. H. Community violence and aggression in dreams: An observation. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 1969, 29, 41-42.

Rohner, R. P. A worldwide study of sex differences in aggression: A universalistic perspective. Ethos, 1976, 4, 57-72.

Roth, S., & Kubal, L. The effects of noncontingent reinforcement on tasks of differing importance: Facilitation and learned helplessness effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 680-691.

Rothenberg, A. On anger. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1971, 128, 454-460.

Rule, B. G., & Nesdale, A. R. Moral judgement of aggressive behavior. In R. G. Geen & E. C. O'Neal (Eds.), Perspectives on aggression. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Rule, B. G., Nesdale, A. R., & Dyck, R. Objective self-awareness and differing standards of aggression. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1975, 6, 82-88.

Rumenik, D. K., Capasso, D. R., & Hendrick, C. Experimenter sex effects in behavioral research. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 852-877.

Schill, T., Rader, G., Evans, R., & Segall, S. Defense preference of high- and low-hostility-guilt subjects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 867.

Schless, A. P., Mendels, J., Kipperman, A., & Cochrane, C. Depression and hostility. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1974, 159, 91-100.

Sears, R. R. relation of early socialization experiences to aggression in middle childhood. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 466-492.

Serbin, L. A., O'Leary, K. D., Kent, R. N., & Tonick, I. J. A comparison of teacher response to the pre-academic and problem behavior of boys and girls. Child Development, 1973, 44, 796-804.

Seligman, M. E. P. Helplessness: On depression, development and death. San Francisco: Freeman, 1975.

Stein, H. H., & Bailey, M. M. The socialization of achievement orientation in females. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 345-366.

Sherman, J. A. On the psychology of women: A survey of empirical studies. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Sheridan, C. L., & King, R. G. Obedience to authority with an authentic victim. Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1972, 7, 165-166.

Smith, S. M. The battered child syndrome. London: Buttersworths, 1975.

Steiner, C. Scripts people live. New York: Bantam, 1974

Sternglanz, S. H., & Serbin, L. A. Sex role stereotyping in children's television programs. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 710-715.

Storr, A. Human aggression. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. Violence in the family: An assessment of knowledge and research needs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Boston, 1976.

Swart, C., & Berkowitz, L. Effects of a stimulus associated with a victim's pain on later aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 36, 623-631.

Symonds, M. Psychodynamics of aggression in women. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1976, 36, 195-203.

Taylor, S. P., & Smith, I. Aggression as a function of sex of victim and male subject's attitude toward women. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 1095-1098.

Tiger, L. Men in groups. London: Thomas Nelson, 1969.

Toby, J. Violence and the masculine ideal: Some qualitative data. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus, Violence in the family. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Unger, R. Male is greater than female: The socialization of status inequality. The Counseling Psychologist, 1976, 6, 2-9.

Vantress, F. E., & Williams, C. B. The effect of the presence of the provocator and the opportunity to counteraggress on systolic blood pressure. Journal of General Psychology, 1972, 86, 63-68.

Weissman, M., & Klerman, G. L. Sex difference and the epidemiology of depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1977, 34, 98-111.

Weissman, M., & Paykel, E. S. The depressed woman: A study of social relationships. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Whiting, B. B., & Edwards, C. P. A cross-cultural analysis of sex differences in the behavior of children. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 91, 171-188.

Wolfgang, M. E. Victim-precipitated criminal homicide. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1957, 48, 1-11.

Wolfgang, M. E. A sociological analysis of criminal homicide. Federal Probation, 1961, 23, 48-55.

Wolman, C., & Frank, H. The solo woman in a professional peer group. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 164-171.

Worchel, S., & Teddie, C. The experience of crowding: A two-factor theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 30-40.

Young, D. M., Beier, E. G., Beier, P., & Barton, C. Is chivalry dead? Journal of Communication, 1975, 25, 57-64.

Young, D. M., Korner, K. M., Gill, J. D., & Beier, E. G. Relationship of game aggression to quality of marriage. Paper delivered at the annual convention of the Western Psychological Association, Sacramento, California, 1975.

Zimbardo, P. G. The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse, and chaos. Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1969, 17, 237-307.